IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.R.RAMAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE K.HEMA

MONDAY, THE 20TH AUGUST 2007 / 29TH SRAVANA 1929

RP.No. 783 of 2007(A)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN WPC.21850/2007
.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/RESPONDENTS 3 TO 5
---

1. JYOTHISH KUMAR, CONVENOR, AITUC,
CHERUSSERY BHAGOM CHAVARA, KOLLAM.

2. PETER, SECRETARY, INTUC UNIT,
JYOTHISH KUMAR, CONVENOR, AITUC,
CHERUSSERY BHAGOM CHAVARA, KOLLAM.

3. THULASI, SECRETARY
CITUC UNIT, CHERUSSERY BHAGOM CHAVARA, KOLLAM.

BY ADV. SRI.T.A.UNNIKRISHNAN
SRI.K.SATHEESH KUMAR

RESPONDENTS: PETITIONERS RESPONDENTS 1 &2
---

1. ANIL A ROSBAN DALE
CHAVARA P.O. KOLLAM.

2. INDIAN RARE ERATHS LTD.,
REP. BY ITS CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER.
CHAVARA P.O. KOLLAM.

3. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CHAVARA POLICE STATION,
CHAVARA P.O. KOLLAM.

BY ADV. DR.K.P.SATHEESAN
GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.KANNAPPU

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 20/08/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

P.R.RAMAN & K.HEMA,JJ.

R.P.NO. 783 OF 2007
IN
W.P.(C).NO. 21850 OF 2007

Dated this the 20th day of August, 2007

O R D E R

Raman, J.

This review petition is filed by respondents 3 to 4 in the Writ Petition. According to them, they received the notice in the Writ Petition on the posting date and they could not make effective representation. Hence, according to them, no opportunity of being heard is granted. We heard both sides. The Writ Petition is filed for police protection for removing the obstruction alleged to have been caused by the respondents. There was already an interim order which was in force. The petitioner has no complaint about the interim order. In the final order we made the interim order absolute. No finding as such is rendered. According to learned counsel for review petitioners, they are not causing any obstruction, nor are they demanding any Mamool. For the limited purpose of disposing of the police protection matter, it is unnecessary to go into the merits of the contentions so raised. Only if there is any obstruction, the question of police interference in the matter arises and once there is

obstruction, certainly, the petitioner is entitled for police protection. In the above circumstances, we direct that in case of any obstruction caused by respondents 3 and 4 in the Writ petition, police shall render necessary protection if a complaint is made in this behalf by the writ petitioner.

Review Petition is disposed of as above.

P.R.RAMAN, JUDGE

K.HEMA, JUDGE

vgs.